

EIGHTH FLOOR WASHINGTON D.C 20006

(202) 833-4422

Telecopier (202) 296-7458



CONSULTING ENGINEERS
SIAMAK HARANDI
DEAKIN LAUER

RICHARD S. BECKER
JEFFREY E. RUMMEL
OF COUNSEL
JAMES S. FINERFROCK

March 21, 1995

William F. Caton, Acting Secretary Federal Communications Commission Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re:

In re Application of Ellis Thompson Corporation for Facilities in the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service on Frequency Block A in Market No. 134, Atlantic City, New Jersey CC Docket No. 94-136

File No. 14261-CL-P-134-A-86

Dear Mr. Caton:

Transmitted herewith on behalf of Ameritel is one (1) original and six (6) copies of its Motion for Leave to File Response filed with respect to the above-referenced proceeding.

Should any questions arise with respect to this matter, please communicate directly with this office.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard S. Becker

Attorney for Ameritel

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd_ List A B C D E

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1 1995

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

PRINTING COMMUNICATIONS COMMUNICATIONS
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In re Application of CC DOCKET NO. 94-136

ELLIS THOMPSON CORPORATION File No. 14261-CL-P-134-A-86

For Facilities in the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service on Frequency Block A in Market No. 134, Atlantic City, New Jersey

To: Administrative Law Judge Joseph Chachkin

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE RESPONSE

Ameritel ("Ameritel"), by its attorneys and pursuant to Section 1.294(d) of the Commission's Rules, hereby seeks leave to file the "Response" that it is submitting simultaneously herewith in the above-captioned proceeding. As set forth herein, Ameritel respectfully submits that good cause exists for authorization and acceptance of the Response.

1. In a February 6, 1995, "Petition To Intervene" ("Petition"), Ameritel sought leave to intervene as a party in interest in the above-captioned proceeding. Ameritel's Petition was challenged by pleadings filed by all existing parties to the proceeding.²

¹47 C.F.R. §1.294(d).

²See "Comments On Petition To Intervene" ("Comments") filed jointly by The Wireless Telecommunications Bureau ("Bureau") and Telephone and Data Systems, Inc. ("TDS") on February 15, 1995; "Opposition To Petition For Leave To Intervene" ("Amcell Opposition") filed on February 15, 1995, by American Cellular Network Corp. ("Amcell"); "Opposition To Petition To Intervene" ("ETC Opposition") filed on February 21, 1995, by Ellis Thompson Corporation ("ETC"). For ease of reference: (1) the Comments, Amcell Opposition and ETC Opposition may be referred to collectively hereinafter as the "Oppositions;" and (2) the Bureau,

- 2. Section 1.294(b) of the Commission's Rules normally prohibits replies to oppositions filed in interlocutory matters, such as Ameritel's Petition.³ Section 1.294(d), however, provides that, "[a]dditional pleadings may be filed only if specifically requested or authorized by the person(s) who are to make the ruling."⁴ In the instant case, Ameritel respectfully submits that good cause exists for authorization and acceptance of Ameritel's Response.
- Ameritel's right to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding as the successor-in-interest to Ameritel, Inc., the fifth-ranked mutually-exclusive ("MX") applicant for the Atlantic City, New Jersey, Metropolitan Statistical Area ("MSA") nonwireline cellular authorization ("Authorization"). All Existing Parties included a multitude of conjecture, speculation and insinuation in an attempt to discredit Ameritel's clear and factually-supported assertion. All Existing Parties requested that at a minimum, the presiding officer in this proceeding require Ameritel to submit additional information regarding its ownership structure and its succession to the Atlantic City MX application originally filed by Ameritel, Inc.
- 4. Ameritel believes that its Petition more than adequately demonstrates that it is an MX applicant with standing to intervene

TDS, Amcell and ETC may be referred to collectively hereinafter as the "Existing Parties."

³47 C.F.R. §1.294(b).

⁴47 C.F.R. §1.294(d).

Amerited believes, however, that it must refute the campaign of disinformation launched by the Existing Parties in the Oppositions by providing information that conclusively dispels the questions and suspicions that the Existing Parties attempted to raise against Amerited in their Oppositions. This information will not only expedite consideration of Amerited's interlocutory Petition, but will also rebut the speculative and dilatory allegations raised in the Oppositions. Amerited must also emphasize that its Response is not intended to reply to the arguments set forth in the Oppositions. Amerited's Response is tailored to provide facts which demonstrate that the questions raised in the Oppositions regarding Amerited's ownership of its Atlantic City application are inaccurate and must be rejected.

⁵47 C.F.R. §1.223(a); 47 U.S.C. §309(e); <u>Algreg Cellular Engineering</u>, CC Docket No. 91-142, 6 FCC Rcd 5299, 5300 (Rev.Bd. 1991).

wherefore, for all of the foregoing reasons, Ameritel respectfully submits that good cause exists for authorization and acceptance of Ameritel's simultaneously-filed Response. Ameritel requests that the Response be considered and Ameritel reiterates the request made in its Petition that Ameritel be permitted to intervene as a party in the above-captioned proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

AMERITEL

Richard S. Becker
James S. Finerfrock
Jeffrey E. Rummel

Its Attorneys

Richard S. Becker & Associates, Chartered 1915 Eye Street, Northwest Eighth Floor Washington, DC 20006 (202) 833-4422

Date: March 21, 1995

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jeffrey E. Rummel, an associate in the law firm of Richard S. Becker & Associates, Chartered, hereby certify that I have on this 21st day of March, 1995, sent by First Class United States mail, postage prepaid, copies of the foregoing "MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE RESPONSE" to the following:

Honorable Joseph Chachkin*
Federal Communications Commission
2000 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Joseph Paul Weber, Trial Attorney*
Terrence E. Reideler, Trial Attorney*
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Enforcement Division
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.; Room 644
Washington, DC 20554

Regina Keeney, Chief*
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
2025 M Street, N.W.; Room 5002
Washington, DC 20554

Alan Y. Naftalin, Esquire
Herbert D. Miller, Jr., Esquire
Koteen & Naftalin
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036
Counsel for Telephone and Data
Systems, Inc.

Alan N. Saltpeter, Esquire Mayer, Brown & Platt 190 South LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60603 Counsel for Telephone and Data Systems, Inc.

^{*} Hand delivered

Louis Gurman, Esquire William D. Freedman, Esquire Doane Kiechel, Esquire Andrea S. Miano, Esquire Gurman, Kurtis, Blask & Freedman, Chartered 1400 16th Street, N.W. Suite 500 Washington, DC 20036 Counsel for American Cellular Network Corporation

Stuart Feldstein, Esquire Richard Rubin, Esquire Christopher G. Wood, Esquire Fleishman & Walsh, L.L.P. 1400 16th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036 Counsel for Ellis Thompson Corporation

David A. Lokting, Esquire Stoll, Stoll, Berne, Fischer, Portnoy & Lokting 209 S.W. Oak Street Portland, OR 97204 Counsel for Ellis Thompson/ Ellis Thompson Corporation

E. Rummel

2